3

1 (In open court.)

- 2 THE CLERK: All rise.
- 3 THE COURT: Everybody can have a seat.
- 4 THE CLERK: This is civil cause for a status
- 5 conference, docket number 17 CV 5317 and 18 CV 2999, Pimental
- 6 versus Delta Airlines, Inc.
- 7 Counsel, parties, state your appearance, plaintiff 8 first.
- 9 MR. PIMENTAL: Aasir Azzarmi, present.
- 10 MR. KILLEEN: Brendan Killeen and Hanna Martin, from
- 11 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, on behalf of the defendant.
- 12 THE COURT: A couple of things. Our court reporter is
- 13 taking down everything that everybody says. If you talk too
- 14 fast or interrupt, then it makes her job harder. So I'm going
- 15 to ask everybody to keep that in mind.
- We are going to talk about both of these cases
- 17 | together. I'm just going to run through what I think is
- 18 outstanding in some of these matters.
- A couple of just housekeeping things. You know, we
- 20 have you as Mr. Pimental. Is it okay if I call you that?
- MR. PIMENTAL: Sure, of course; and I think maybe if
- 22 there was ever a trial, some of my coworkers would probably
- 23 know me as Pimental. So that would probably be better for
- 24 corporate.
- THE COURT: Okay. Do me a favor. Pull the microphone

a little bit closer to you.

So if that's okay, that's what we will call you.

Your mail keeps getting returned. I know there is something recently that was filed. Do we have that straightened out now?

MR. PIMENTAL: Actually, I have to go to the post office after this because what I think it is is that perhaps the court is sending it under Pimental, and that's not where it's maybe logged. I don't know why they are not depositing it in my box; but I will find out today, and I will bring the results in to the clerk's office because I think that people think that I never paid for this post office box.

THE COURT: Just let us know, because I want to make sure that you are getting whatever is being sent to you. Okay.

So a couple of things. I have lost count of how many motions you have filed, Mr. Pimental, and I am very interested in both of your claims. If you keep filing long, long things, it distracts from me being able to focus on the essence of your claim. I know most of this stems from the fact that you aren't a lawyer; and, believe me, having been through law school, it's not easy to keep up with all of these things.

I'm just going to go through a couple of things that might make this a bit easier for everybody. The other thing, though, at the outset, you have to stop insulting Judge
Orenstein. He is not going to get off the case. He is an

Pimental v. Delta

excellent judge, and he is paying careful, careful attention to your case. So, you know, we can't all be thrilled, you know, you are probably not going to get rid of me either. So, you know, into each life a little rain must fall; but you are stuck with me, and you are lucky to have Judge Orenstein. He is a very smart person and he is giving very careful attention to all of your concerns.

So, but you just have to -- I'm not going to pay any attention to it. It's just really, really not appropriate. So that has to stop.

If you file something that has some sensitive stuff in it -- you know, there are some images there with some bad language, things that discuss sexual matters and things like that -- you have to let us know that that should be filed under seal, because there are privacy interests of concern here. So, please, if that's going to happen, just let us know it should be under seal.

Then, finally, I don't know if you are aware that each one of the judges here has individual practices and rules. All right.

Do you have a copy of mine?

MR. PIMENTAL: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: Okay. So they are mostly just to help me so I can keep track of everything that's happening. I have page limitations on motions, and you can't fax things to

chambers unless you get permission to do it. That's not to be difficult or bossy or anything like that. Those rules make -- you know, I have a lot of cases, and those rules make sure that I can handle those cases efficiently.

So what I'm going to do now is just go through some of these motions that have been filed; and, if I'm forgetting some, I think you will let me know.

There are a number of motions for judicial notice.

There are at least nine of them. So the thing about judicial notice, a lot of times you are asking me to take judicial notice of cases and things like that. You don't have to do that. When you file whatever substantive motions you file, which will be filed at the appropriate time, you can just cite the cases in your brief. You don't have to — that's not what judicial notice is for.

Judicial notice is for things like if you are in a trial and somebody wants you to take judicial notice that on January 1 the temperature was, you know, 30 degrees. That's what judicial notice is. Citing cases, which is something that everybody does when they file a kind of a brief or something, you don't have to ask me to take judicial notice of that.

Just when we get to the point where we are doing motions, summary judgment, when you file your brief, you can just cite the cases; and therein I will surely read them.

So those motions for judicial notice I'm denying, just

because they don't mean anything on their own.

Now, you also ask that I transfer this case to the Southern District. The first question I have is -- you say you have a lawyer that will represent you in the Southern District but not here -- why can't that person represent you here?

MR. PIMENTAL: I'm not sure, but he said he is registered in SDNY; and when I asked him, well, I'm EDNY, he told me to come there. I don't know if at one point I did see a sign in the clerk's office and it said maybe at the time or something, it was October, there was — they weren't taking applications or something. I don't know.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, I'm not a hundred percent sure what the lawyer's concerns are, but even if you are not admitted here, if you are admitted to practice in the Southern District, you can ask to get admitted here. It's called pro hac vice, and you file an application; and I'm sure the lawyer knows this. All the lawyer would have to do is file this application that shows that they are a lawyer in good standing in some other place.

So because, otherwise, there is really no reason to switch the case. The main reason, really, for you, is that I have had the case for a while. I'm pretty familiar with it. And Judge Orenstein has had it for a while. If this were to get switched to another judge, they would have to start all over from ground zero; and it would take that much longer for

Pimental v. Delta

your case to get resolved, for your two cases to get resolved.

So I'm going to deny the motion to change venue.

But I encourage you to speak to the lawyer about whether or not he would, he or she, would be willing to appear pro hac vice here or whatever the issue is.

Have you spoken to that lawyer recently?

MR. PIMENTAL: No. He told me to call him when I get the change of motion, change of venue motion approved.

But, Your Honor, what I'm trying to say is, of course there are other factors that I'm sure maybe I probably mentioned; and it's not me that's judge shopping, but lawyers, when you already have certain judges assigned, sometimes they don't like their individual practice rules. And so, you know, when it's -- they -- when you are already in the situation, they can pick things, what they like, what they don't like.

THE COURT: But they don't have any control over who gets the case. So, I mean, Judge Weinstein asked me to take your other case because it's connected. So I agreed to do that for Judge Weinstein.

But when you file a case here, it goes into a wheel, and it just gets assigned to a district judge and to a magistrate judge. That's just how it works. We have too many cases to try to pick and choose. So we don't do it, but a litigant surely could never engineer it so that they get their case assigned; and I don't think these folks would have picked

me anyway. We don't know each other.

So, anyway, so I mean I hate to give you the bad news. I know you said in one of your submissions you really like Judge Block, but he is not available. So you are stuck with me. He is a good judge, but you are stuck with me. I'm sorry about that. So we are not going to -- we won't be changing venue. All right.

Now, there is another motion that you filed — and just forgive me for this; I'm really just trying to keep myself organized — that you wanted me to deem — it was about your 56.1 statement that you submitted. Because I denied your summary judgment motion without prejudice, just because we are not at that stage of the proceedings where it's appropriate. So they don't have to answer your 56.1 statement yet. So that motion is also denied.

I think -- I get the feeling that you understand the issue with the summary judgment. Just the way the rules work, we don't -- a summary judgment motion is not decided until all of the discovery is done, and the reason for that is that the standard in summary judgment is that you can only grant the motion if the two of you don't have any factual disputes about something. Since you haven't finished finding out what the facts are, you can't do it yet. So it's a waste of your time. So that's why.

It's not because I don't want to consider it. It's

just that it's just not time to do that. So all of those things with respect to summary judgment, we are just not there yet. So anything having to do with the summary judgment, it's just premature.

I think we already talked a little bit about Judge Orenstein. You know, you are awfully hard on him, but he really has been giving careful, as I said, really careful consideration to your case; and so, you know, I'm not going to review his orders. He is smarter than I am. So I'm not reviewing any of his discovery orders. They are all correct.

He did ask you to prepare a narrative statement. You have to do that. That is something that we do in pro se cases because sometimes, as I'm sure you have experienced, because you are not a lawyer, it gives the judge a better chance of -- a better understanding of what it is you are actually claiming. Sometimes you may think your claim falls under one type of law, but a judge will look at it and -- what we do when people file pro se submissions is that we give it the most liberal interpretation possible.

So if you are claiming that something happened and I look at it and I think, wow, that doesn't really seem like it's under this statute, it seems more appropriate under this statute, I will construe that just generously to think that's what you mean. This is a help for you. That's why we do that in pro se cases. I'm not trying to make your life difficult.

Pimental v. Delta

Now, it's true -- you know, and any lawyer will tell you this -- that sometimes the judge is going to agree with you, sometimes the judge is not going to agree with you. We just do our best to interpret the law as we understand it. It doesn't mean that, you know, we have something personal against you or anything like that. Not at all.

I mean, we are very accustomed to having people here represent themselves; and I know that it's not easy for somebody who is not a lawyer to find his way through what can be a pretty complicated situation.

So I have sort of spoken generally about your case. I was really focusing on the gender discrimination case.

Then, the case that Judge Weinstein had before, I think you understand this, but just correct me if I'm wrong. Because you are representing yourself, it can't be a class action. I think it's not allowed. I think I -- in one of your submissions, I recognized that you understood that; and so it can't be a class action.

The person who you consulted about representing you on the other case, would that person also be willing to represent you on the case, the New York Labor Law case, the overtime case? Do you think that person would represent you on both cases?

MR. PIMENTAL: No, Your Honor. If I could have 30 seconds.

Pimental v. Delta

THE COURT: Sure, but have mercy on our court reporter. So just talk slowly. All right.

MR. PIMENTAL: Sorry. I'm working with the airlines and in New York we talk fast.

Basically a lot of time the class actions lawyers are different from the employment discrimination lawyers, and that was maybe one of the issues with my first lawyers. They never did class actions.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PIMENTAL: They were forcing me to settle, because, of course, it was advantageous for them to get a part of that settlement; but I didn't want to abandon the class, and I still don't want to abandon the class, which is why I need a lawyer. So, Your Honor, I don't want -- because it's not just about me because these issues are still going on, which is why I asked for the permanent injunction or temporary, whatever the court is willing to provide.

So, Your Honor, what I'm asking, maybe because it's not about me. I mean, I could have taken the \$5,000. I didn't want to do that because I don't want to abandon my colleagues, who I promised I was going to try to do this for a lot of people.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PIMENTAL: So if you say something, you have to be strong in your convictions and try to do that. So I think I

13

1 would -- now that it got reassigned, it's not so easy for me to 2 find a lawyer. But I still would like to try to do that 3 because I don't want to abandon the class again still.

THE COURT: So I know you have had kind of a breakdown in the relationship -- you had two lawyers on this before, right, or am I mixing up my cases?

MR. PIMENTAL: On the class action?

THE COURT: Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PIMENTAL: Yeah, because the first ones, they never did class actions. They only started it because they wanted like a quick settlement. So it was just like when I didn't settle, there was some tension there, whatever, and we parted ways. And so I had to find -- they wanted me to find a new class action lawyer anyway, because they weren't experienced with that, if it was to go forward.

So I did have another lawyer after that. Once again, when I didn't settle because I didn't want to abandon the class, there was more problems, which is where I'm at now; and now I want to get a lawyer to represent the class.

THE COURT: All right. So you are still working on that?

MR. PIMENTAL: Well, I think --

THE COURT: You want me to appoint one? Because we can't do that.

MR. PIMENTAL: I would love that.

Pimental v. Delta

1 THE COURT: I know, but that's not the way it works.

MR. PIMENTAL: I understand, Your Honor; but is it possible -- I think Magistrate Levy, who I never met, and I never met Judge Weinstein, and because my lawyer showed up because so I never met them or disliked them, because I never met them.

THE COURT: They are both wonderful.

MR. PIMENTAL: I will take your word for it.

When I found out I was abandoned because I settled, because like PACER, when something happens, I don't get an e-mail because I was never pro se. So I didn't know what was going on.

So when I found out from the pro se lawyer and the office here at EDNY that this was happening, I went to the clerk's office. I wrote a letter asking Magistrate Levy, who was very kind and gave me until the 15th of this month to find a lawyer.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. PIMENTAL: Since that time is expiring and I didn't know it got reassigned to a different judge, and then the lawyer that was interested told me he is not interested, and now here we are.

THE COURT: I will give you some more time, if that's what you want.

MR. PIMENTAL: Okay.

15

THE COURT: I think -- I can't remember exactly how 1 2 this happened, but, you know, if Judge Weinstein asks me to do 3 something on a case I almost always say yes. So I think he saw that we had this and that we should handle both of them. 4 5 does make some sense, because it's the same lawyers on the other side, and it involves some of the same group of people. 6 7 So if Judge Weinstein asked me to do him a favor on a case, I 8 will definitely do it.

You know, I'm not as smart as he is, but I care about your case. So that should be fine. So let's give you -that's one thing we can get done today. Why don't we give you -- you want to say until the middle of March, to try to find a lawyer?

MR. PIMENTAL: Of course. Do I have any say in that matter?

THE COURT: If you feel like you need a little more time -- you are not going to oppose that, are you?

MR. KILLEEN: No, Your Honor.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. So do you want some more time? you want to try the beginning of April?

MR. PIMENTAL: Okay. But --

THE COURT: The only other thing I'm going to suggest to you, just having done this for a number of years here and other places, you know, you can get so wrapped up in your case that you can't think of anything else and that you start

thinking that everybody is against you and that if they don't see things your way that they must be conspiring against you.

Sometimes people are against you, but sometimes they are not; and it's possible that these lawyers that you have had before are just trying to give you their best judgment. You may not agree with it, but that doesn't necessarily mean that somebody is trying to do something tricky to you.

So I would just encourage you, when you are thinking about this case, to not immediately jump to the conclusion that somebody is trying to cheat you. Because it's really -- at least insofar as Judge Orenstein and I are concerned, we wouldn't be -- we wouldn't have these jobs if that's what we wanted to do. The reason you take this job is to try to -- one reason, is to try to help people work out their differences.

So I know that you were quite adamant in rejecting the settlement, but you may want to think about it, assuming that it's still even on the table, for the labor law case. I'm not going to ask you to tell me that now, but, you know, maybe -- I don't know this case as well as your other case, but maybe the lawyers, in their best legal judgment, thought, you know, this is not a winner. You are their client, and they wanted to get the best possible outcome for you that they could get.

So I just encourage you to be open to that possibility, that sometimes even though we feel very strongly about our positions and about, you know, feeling that someone

Pimental v. Delta

has wronged us, sometimes what an objective person, who is your lawyer, can help you figure out is whether maybe you have been looking at it the right way. I'm not making any judgment about that one way or the other, but I would just encourage you to think about that a little bit.

So how about April -- what's the first week in April?

THE CLERK: 3rd.

THE COURT: April 3rd, and if for some reason you feel like you are getting close and you haven't gotten anybody by then, you just let me know, and we will see if you need some extra time. Does that sound good?

MR. PIMENTAL: Can I ask a question?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. PIMENTAL: Because I don't know how this works, especially with the class action lawsuit. You know, I gave you some information because I didn't know what you knew and what you didn't know; and, you know, I don't have access to that like PACER case and I don't know if my lawyers told, I guess, Judge Weinstein or Judge Levy, I don't know if they mentioned that either, because I gave you the information, I guess would you be able to do — to say that this doesn't have merit and I shouldn't even waste my time trying to find a lawyer, or how does that work?

THE COURT: So I know what you are asking. You know, we really can't do that. We can't give you legal advice.

Pimental v. Delta

Sometimes we have, you know, premotion conferences here. I don't generally do it with people who are representing themselves, but we have premotion conferences because, say, the lawyers on the other side will submit — they say they want to make a motion; and sometimes I will give them what my preliminary sense is, just so they can decide whether or not they want to use their time by making that motion.

So but I can't give you legal advice, and I know that's difficult for people. I mean, I think you can check with the pro se office. I think you seem to know them pretty well. Right?

MR. PIMENTAL: You know, it's funny, they are very nice. The lawyer, she is great and has a dog down there, really cute. It's her service animal. You can play with it, a nice environment; and they are always helpful. They will answer your questions, even in an e-mail, but like they don't represent you. So it's a fine line. You can ask questions, but it's not like they are going to be your lawyer or anything like that.

So, Your Honor, I think the thing I was trying to figure out was if, let's say, I can't find a lawyer, the way I was reading some of the -- what was it, Supreme Court of

New York -- am I allowed to go to arbitration for this, whether

I'm by myself representing the class, or to get a lawyer for the day to represent me in arbitration? Is that an option?

Pimental v. Delta

THE COURT: Well, I don't think there is an enforceable arbitration clause in the contract. Is there?

MR. KILLEEN: There is not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: See, that's the problem. Arbitration, you can only get arbitration if there is some clause in a contract that forces Delta to go to arbitration. So, I don't think that's a possibility in this case.

You know, my recollection of this case was that

Delta's position was that you can't assert an overtime claim

under the New York Labor Law because you are what's called an

exempt employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act, which would

only entitle you to get that one-and-a-half times the minimum

wage overtime rate, which -- correct me if I'm wrong -- I think

you received. Also, because you earned more than New York's

minimum wage, you wouldn't be entitled to spread your hours of

pay. I believe that's what the defense's position is.

But I don't want to -- do I have that about right?

MR. KILLEEN: You do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, whether or not that is meritorious, I haven't looked at yet because I was waiting to see if you could get a lawyer who could help you out with that. But that might be a -- that's what their position is. That might be a bar to your case.

If it is, you know, I would -- I mean, I'm not making a decision about it, but those are the sorts of things that a

Pimental v. Delta

lawyer would be able to tell you, and, you know, then you may realize this isn't worth your time. You have still got the other case.

So just while I'm at it, there is something, you want a preliminary injunction. I can't do any of those things in this case because you don't have standing because this is not a class action, and I don't think you work at Delta any more.

Right?

MR. PIMENTAL: Well, I don't. However, I do go to worker's comp hearings, and they may send me back to work soon so -- because there is another issue involved. So I can't say that I'm going back yet.

THE COURT: Okay. But it's not a class action and so that's -- I can't grant that motion.

So I think what we will do is just -- bottom line
here -- I think the next thing for us to do is to figure out
what's -- I'm going to ask defense counsel -- what's -- I know
I should know the answer to this, but I have gotten myself -is there anything outstanding?

Are there any motions? I know there is the proposed motion to dismiss on the labor law case. Discovery is not done?

MR. KILLEEN: No. So, Your Honor, the motion to dismiss in the wage-and-hour case is fully briefed.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KILLEEN: Judge Weinstein at one point had directed the parties to --

THE COURT: Convert it to a summary judgment?

MR. KILLEEN: -- convert it to a summary judgment.

THE COURT: I'm not sure that I'm going to take that same approach, because I don't think we have enough discovery. We don't have any discovery, right?

MR. KILLEEN: Not in that case, Your Honor. It involves a different position and different --

THE COURT: So I have to look at that a little more closely; but, to me, I don't think that's an approach that will work for me. But I think I'm just going to hold off on that because I'm going to have some hope that Mr. Pimental can get some — can get a lawyer to give him some advice on that.

So does that work for you?

MR. KILLEEN: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Then just tell me what's left to do in discovery on the other case.

MR. KILLEEN: Your Honor, can I address one other thing with the wage and hour, so we can close out wage and hour?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KILLEEN: We had filed -- and I think you alluded to it earlier, at least in terms of certain documents -- but the proposed confidential settlement agreement has been

22

1 attached to -- and I forget which case. It's been attached 2 twice now as an exhibit, but we filed a request to seal that 3 document.

4 THE COURT: That will be sealed, yes.

MR. KILLEEN: My apologies. I forget the exact docket number, but it also, in a filing yesterday, appeared as Exhibit 1 in another filing.

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Is that from Mr. Pimental?

MR. KILLEEN: Correct.

10 THE COURT: So can you not do that anymore, file that? 11 It's not necessary to keep doing it.

MR. PIMENTAL: I'm sorry. File what exactly?

THE COURT: The confidential settlement.

MR. PIMENTAL: Oh, well, don't you usually have to give it to the court, whether you signed it or not?

THE COURT: I think you have now given it to me about 16 times. So you don't have to do it anymore.

MR. PIMENTAL: Sure.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. So that's sealed.

MR. KILLEEN: Yes, and I think the wage and hour --

THE COURT: I think we are done with that one.

MR. KILLEEN: Yes.

THE COURT: Then there is discovery still to be done on this other case. Have you done your deposition yet?

MR. PIMENTAL: No, Your Honor, but can I just ask one

Pimental v. Delta

- 1 | question about the wage and hour?
- 2 THE COURT: Sure.
- 3 MR. PIMENTAL: Okay. So my question is: Is it
- 4 possible to go to mediation for that, or how would you initiate
- 5 that?
- 6 THE COURT: Do you want to?
- 7 MR. KILLEEN: You would ask us if we want to engage in
- 8 | mediation. I would represent at this time I don't think my
- 9 client is willing to, but I can raise that after this
- 10 conference.
- 11 THE COURT: Yes. They have got to talk to their
- 12 client too. All right. So that's something that you will talk
- 13 to each other about.
- 14 Did you have your deposition yet?
- MR. PIMENTAL: No, Your Honor. Can I just ask a
- 16 follow-up, because it was something still in the same spirit of
- 17 that question.
- 18 THE COURT: Sure.
- MR. PIMENTAL: So I guess the mediation thing, when I
- 20 would get a lawyer, they would probably engage with them and
- 21 try to work that out. That would be possible.
- 22 My question is now: Originally this originated in
- 23 | state court. So let's say I can't find a lawyer or let's say
- 24 whatever the case would be, and it would just be my claim.
- Can this court send that back to state court?

24

1 THE COURT: Why is it here, diversity?

2 MR. KILLEEN: Which matter, Your Honor?

3 THE COURT: The wage and hour.

4 MR. KILLEEN: It is diversity, and alleged damages are

over \$75,000.

5

8

9

13

6 THE COURT: I see.

7 MR. KILLEEN: I'm sorry. It is under -- it's also

under CAFA.

THE COURT: Is it FLSA?

10 MR. KILLEEN: It is not. It is -- I'm trying to

11 remember now. Just New York Labor Law.

12 It was removed under -- with respect to the individual

and under CAFA. So CAFA now, depending on whether or not

14 Mr. Pimental is represented.

15 THE COURT: But if it were just him?

16 MR. KILLEEN: I believe the way the claims are

17 | written, it's still over \$75,000, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: All right. The other thing, you know, if

19 it gets sent back to state court you are just starting all over

20 again. I don't know why you would want to do that.

MR. PIMENTAL: Do you want an answer?

22 THE COURT: Not really, because I think you are going

23 to say something unflattering. Okay.

So we have Mr. Pimental's deposition to still do.

25 What else do we still have to do, discoverywise?

Pimental v. Delta

MR. KILLEEN: So, Your Honor, under Judge Orenstein's order, Mr. Pimental had until Monday to provide the narrative, identify which out of the 1200-plus RFAs he wanted us to respond to, which outstanding discovery requests he felt that our prior responses to were deficient, what additional documents he would want, and identify witnesses that would support his narrative.

THE COURT: By this past Monday or coming Monday?

MR. KILLEEN: February 4.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KILLEEN: It's our position -- and I believe we still need to go through Judge Orenstein for this -- but that Mr. Pimental has not complied with that.

THE COURT: Are you scheduled to see Judge Orenstein again at any time soon?

MR. KILLEEN: The status conference is scheduled in March, after -- so we were supposed to receive all that by February 4. By March 6 we are supposed to respond.

THE COURT: So just if Mr. Pimental were to give that to you next week, would that be acceptable?

MR. KILLEEN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So can you do that, please? You are going to give your narrative, and then whatever else Judge Orenstein wanted you to do. I will call him to let him know that I extended the deadline.

Pimental v. Delta

1 Shall we make it next Friday?

MR. KILLEEN: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. You can do that. Okay. So what's the date of that?

THE CLERK: The 15th.

THE COURT: So by February 15 you are going to provide the narrative; and let's just make the record crystal clear so I remember, and so it's clear to Mr. Pimental. It's going to be his narrative, and he has a number of things that he feels were insufficiently answered. Correct?

MR. KILLEEN: Yes, Your Honor. It's Docket 97, for reference purposes.

THE COURT: Okay. So and, you know, just for everybody's -- so everybody can keep it straight, it doesn't have to be 500 pages long. It should be, you know, you want to get your point across, and you don't have to -- I know you have strong feelings about things; but rather than, you know, saying mean things about the other side, just tell them what you think is inappropriate, and that enables them to figure out if they can supplement whatever they have given or to say we disagree with you. So that, so February 15 for that.

So the dates that we have fixed right now, at least as far as I'm concerned, you are going to, by that April 3rd date, you are going to let us know about your progress with getting a lawyer. I suppose you are going to speak to the lawyer that

Dimental - Dalta

Pimental v. Delta

only wanted to go to the Southern District, about coming here.

It's not that far, you know. So it's really right across the
river.

So if he is not admitted, there are steps that -- or she; I don't even know if the person is male or female -- but you will let us know by April 3rd. If it comes before that, that's even better; you will just post a letter.

You are going to take care of the address issue so I can make sure that you get everything that you are supposed to get.

Is there anything else from your side that we need to do?

MR. KILLEEN: To that end, Your Honor, we have e-mailed Mr. Pimental our production as well as his own production numerous times. We have yet to get a notification. The way our secure file transfer works, we get a notification when someone downloads those documents. They haven't downloaded yet; and, like the court, all of our mailings to Mr. Pimental have been returned undeliverable.

THE COURT: Have you gotten their e-mails, Mr. Pimental?

MR. PIMENTAL: I have.

THE COURT: Have you -- they have to know that you have gotten it. So have you down -- so I mean, I'm the least technologically advanced person that there is. So just -- I

Pimental v. Delta

1 | think they are sending it to you so you can have it.

When you say "download," do you mean he can still look at it on his computer?

MR. KILLEEN: Yes, Your Honor. It's just because of the size, at the last conference we said we would provide him his own production because he said his past attorney hadn't handed over the files.

THE COURT: I see. So you have got all that?

MR. PIMENTAL: Yes, and I downloaded it. I don't know why it doesn't show it was downloaded.

THE COURT: But now we have established that you have. So that's good. So that's progress.

MR. KILLEEN: Because that's supposed to facilitate the meet-and-confer process under the order from Judge Orenstein.

THE COURT: It just makes everything easier. All right. So I think we have made some good progress here.

And let's finish the discovery so we can move on to the dispositive motion stage. If you still feel that after discovery is done you want to file a motion for summary judgment, you will do that, following my individual rules. I have a page limit and all of that. But we will keep moving forward, and — have I given you any — every opportunity you need to say something?

MR. KILLEEN: There are two, I think, open items.

29

1 Like you, Your Honor, I have the list of --

THE COURT: That's okay.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3 MR. KILLEEN: One, I understand Mr. Pimental filed a motion to compel in this case, for a privilege log.

THE COURT: Oh, I forgot about that.

MR. KILLEEN: We are putting that together.

THE COURT: Great.

MR. KILLEEN: Mr. Pimental also served us with a subpoena for the documents that he believes he should receive through the -- I think that was his attempt at complying with the order.

THE COURT: Don't do that. No subpoenas. They will follow the discovery order; and, if there is a problem with that, you take it up with Judge Orenstein. I don't think we need to be -- I don't think it's a proper use of the subpoena.

MR. KILLEEN: We didn't either, that's why I wanted to present it here.

As part of that subpoena, he also asked permission to appear on Delta's premises in, I believe, human resources, on February 15, which we would object to as well.

THE COURT: Yes. I don't know anything about that.

That's really not the proper subject of a subpoena.

Is there some reason why he can't go to Delta's human resources? I'm not familiar.

MR. KILLEEN: To obtain the documents produced in this

30

- 1 case.
- THE COURT: Oh, I see. I see.
- No, no, no. You can't do that because Delta is
- 4 represented by a lawyer. That's who you work through. Okay?
- 5 That's how that works. That's why they retain a lawyer, so the
- 6 | lawyer can handle all of that. Okay. Good?
- 7 MR. KILLEEN: I have, I think, two more, Your Honor.
- 8 THE COURT: That's okay.
- 9 MR. KILLEEN: Amongst the motions for reconsideration
- 10 and everything else, were, I believe, still motions to deem
- 11 RFAs admitted. Again, they should be covered by the prior
- 12 order. I just want to make clear, because there have been
- 13 motions to compel again, that we are not required to respond to
- 14 those RFAs.
- 15 THE COURT: No.
- MR. KILLEEN: Okay. Now I have two more.
- 17 THE COURT: Okay.
- MR. KILLEEN: In communications with us, including
- 19 this morning, Mr. Pimental has copied a Ms. Erica Lee. I
- 20 | believe she is either a current or former flight attendant, who
- 21 has provided him with a declaration in this case.
- I just want to make clear, if he copies her, that's
- 23 fine. We are not going to respond to include Ms. Lee.
- THE COURT: That's okay. That's fine.
- MR. KILLEEN: Finally, based on the conference and how

Pimental v. Delta

it's gone -- I anticipate what Your Honor will say -- we have been anticipating, in light of Mr. Pimental's disregard for the prior orders, a Rule 41(b) motion.

In light of the fact that he now has until next Friday to try to comply with that discovery order, we will hold off on any such motion.

THE COURT: I think so. I think we all understand each other pretty well here. Really, just try to -- you've got to play along with -- you have to follow the rules, which are not meant to make things harder for you. They are meant to make things move more efficiently, and that's just the way it works.

It's the hard thing about representing yourself. I mean, it's a little bit like having to perform surgery without a medical degree, and it's hard.

But you have got to follow the rules. We make everybody follow the rules, and there are good reasons for them. So you really must do that.

I like to tell people who come into my courtroom, this is a drama-free zone. It's -- I attribute to everybody the best intentions, and I -- but in return I expect people to comply with these rules, which are designed to make the litigation flow efficiently.

So I'm not concerned about that. I think Mr. Pimental understands me very well.

Pimental v. Delta

1 So I think we are done. Yes?

MR. PIMENTAL: Your Honor, okay. What I have been trying to address with Judge Orenstein and I guess now with Your Honor, they are very nice when we are here, so very professional, nice; but I'm not saying it's them, because it's probably the client. All right.

In the past -- maybe there was one e-mail recently after Judge Orenstein's January 4 hearing -- but they were not answering any of my e-mails after I was without a lawyer. They do not communicate. They do not send documents.

So because they are being very recalcitrant and not cooperating with the process, this is why there have been problems and I have had to file motions. I --

THE COURT: What is it that you want that you don't have?

MR. PIMENTAL: Everything. This is why we are where we are.

THE COURT: Well, see, I have now, you know, I have read some of the e-mails that you sent. I mean, there is a saying that you get more flies with honey than with vinegar; and they are not -- you know, and I mean this in the nicest possible way -- but you are not always correct about the legal premise that you assert.

So, as I said before, I'm not always going to agree with you, and Judge Orenstein is not always going to agree with

Pimental v. Delta

you; and that's just a fact of life in litigation. So, for example, they sent you your previous production that you said you didn't get from your lawyer, as well as their discovery. They have to know that you got it. So now they do.

So I'm just telling you to back it down a little bit.

You don't have to -- not every -- I'm sure you have other

things to do; and so but when you file something that's 700

pages long, I'm not going to read it, because it's not -- I

mean, I have read a lot of the things that you have submitted,

but no judge is going to read that.

So I mean I'm glad we had the chance to talk about these things, but what I said before I'm quite serious about.

Not everything that happens in a case is meant to, you know, meant to be unfair to you or anything like that. I'm concerned about your case. I want -- but I want it to proceed in an orderly fashion, and the only way we can do that is by adhering to the riles.

I'm sure that you are going to do that. I'm going to -- I will give you that -- you have that February 15 date. You have got -- your mission is to file your narrative and to let them know clearly and succinctly what it is that you feel is lacking in whatever they have given you before. That's your job before February 15.

Then we have to take care of the rest of discovery, and then we will talk about setting a schedule for if there are

Pimental v. Delta

dispositive motions. What I mean by that, if there are summary judgment on either side.

Now, I do have another matter that I have to attend to. So I think we have -- I think we are pretty clear. I feel clear. So the job for you before the 15th is to file that narrative, let them know what else you want; and I think we are good. Okay?

MR. PIMENTAL: One last question, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Surely.

MR. PIMENTAL: So I went to the pro se office here at EDNY, but there is no template to do a narrative. So nobody knows because it's not typical. So I don't even know what to do.

THE COURT: All you -- I mean, I don't generally do discovery, so, but it's just a -- like telling a story about what are the facts underlying your claim. I will tell you this, you are good at writing things. So if you were telling somebody this story of what happened to you, I think that's what Judge Orenstein wants.

Does that sounds right to you?

MR. KILLEEN: Yes. And, Mr. Pimental, I will give you a copy of the order too.

THE COURT: Yes. Just do exactly what he says. It sounds like you know better than anybody, so.

MR. PIMENTAL: And then one last thing is because I

Pimental v. Delta

disagree with Your Honor -- sorry -- I would like leave to do a writ of mandamus.

THE COURT: It's not going to work. You mean you want me to recuse myself or something?

MR. PIMENTAL: No, not you. Yeah, to get Judge Orenstein to disqualify himself.

THE COURT: He is not going to; and, you know, you are making me a little bit mad. You can't do that.

Just because you disagree with Judge Orenstein does not mean that you can be disrespectful to him. This is a place of respect. I have told you before that I don't want to hear any more of those things. Judge Orenstein is a smart, hard-working judge, who is doing his best to give you a fair shake.

No more. No more. You know, I am a patient person, and -- but just because you don't like him -- if we did that with -- if we let people say, I don't really like this judge that much, it would be chaos around here. That's not going to happen. It's not worth pursuing.

So I hope you can accept that you are not going to win that one. Well, then you are distracting yourself from the merits of your case. That's a side road that is -- it's a complete dead end to me.

So, you know, I can't make you focus on the issues; but I'm telling you, in the strongest possible terms, that I

Pimental v. Delta

1	don't look kindly on that, and no other judge would either. So
2	that's the end of that.
3	Okay. So February 15 you are going to file what it is
4	that the narrative. You have got a copy of the order, and
5	then we will see what happens. All right.
6	Thanks so much.
7	MR. KILLEEN: Thank you, Your Honor.
8	(End of proceedings.)
9	0 0 0
10	
11	Certified to be a true and accurate transcript.
12	/s/ Michele Nardone MICHELE NARDONE, CSR Official Court Reporter
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	